Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/463,209	BERGHOF ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Juliet C. Switzer	1634
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n: <u>amended</u>
(1) <u>Juliet C. Switzer</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Michelle Iwamoto</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 January 2005	Time: morning	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
82-94		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHA	Γ WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepdirectly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepdid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief such as the sepdical content of t	on. The examiner will provide a arate record of the substance	a written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
-		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	plicant/Applicant's Representa	tive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested amendments to place the claims in condition for allowance. The examiner suggested amending claim 82 to require "said nucleic acid molecule consists of at least 15 successive nucleotides of SEQ ID NO: 1, wherein said nucleic acid molecule comprises nucleotides 64-73 of SEQ ID NO: 1, 110-121 of SEQ ID NO: 1, or 127-156 of SEQ ID NO: 1, or the sequence complementary to said nucleic acid molecule." The amendment for claim 82 has basis at least on pages 14-15, especially where p. 15 discusses these regions of SEQ ID NO: 1 as being highly conserved in S. aureus relative to other Staphylococcus species. This amendment would overcome a 102 rejection based on Brennan who teaches all possible 10mer oligonucleotides on a microarray. Further, the examiner suggested canceling claim 84 and amending claim 94 to change "having" to "consisting of." Michelle Iwamoto, in a return phone call on 21 January 2005 indicated that applicant did not approve the amendments to the claims. It was agreed that a final office action would be mailed.